

REMARKS

Claim Status

There were 21 claims in the original application. In response to a previous restriction election requirement, claims 11 to 20 were withdrawn and claims 22 to 32 were added. Claim 33 was also previously added. Claim 32 has been cancelled. Claim 33 has been withdrawn in this response in response to a restriction election requirement. Accordingly, claims 1 to 10, and 22 to 31 are under consideration. Claims 1 and 22 are the independent ones of these claims.

Election/Restrictions

The Office Action stated that newly submitted claim 33 is directed to an invention independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed because the computer readable media includes querying an event for information and matching a unique identifier included in the event with the identifier stored in a database, which is not required for the other elected claims. Claim 33 has been withdrawn in this response in response to the election/restriction requirement.

Art Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1 to 10 and 22 to 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 7,051,072 (Stewart). The Examiner stated that Stewart discloses a supply chain management system comprising trading partners, a central hub location, and a unique identifier, encrypted messages, and modifying the message content processed at the central hub and delivering the content to the trading recipients (See Fig. 6 and claims 3 and 11 of Stewart). While the Examiner admitted

that Stewart does not explicitly indicate querying the central hub, the commerce system of Stewart allows for participation of the trading partners in the trading process, and that querying a central hub responsive to an event has been common knowledge in the data processing art. The Examiner felt that to have provided such querying for Stewart would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as such data transfer has been common knowledge in the art.

Stewart relates to a method for providing real-time conversations among business partners, allowing trading partners to act as participants in a complex trading process. Stewart does not modify an event to be uniquely identifiable by a hub, as in the application. While the Examiner felt *querying* a central hub is known in the art, the central hub described in the application processes an event, modifies the event to be uniquely identifiable, delivers the event in its modified form to a set of recipients, and the hub is queried responsive to receipt of said event. So the central hub of the application does more than just querying responsive to an event. Applicant respectfully disagrees that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide all these central hub functions, in addition to the querying function of the central hub. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is patentable over Stewart. Dependent claims 2-10 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and for the reasons set out above, are patentable over Stewart.

Independent claim 22 is the same as independent claim 1, but written in apparatus form. For the reasons set out above regarding the patentability of claim 1, Applicant's believe claim 23 is patentable over Stewart. Dependent claims 23-31 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 22, and are therefore patentable over Stewart for the same reasons explained above.

The above discussion addresses patentability of all independent claims of the application. As regards the dependent claims not specifically discussed, these claims should be patentable over the references together with their base claims and intervening claims, if any.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over Stewart. To discuss any matter pertaining to the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 947-0700. Having made an effort to bring the application in condition for allowance, a timely notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 12, 2007

/Steven A. Swernofsky/
Steven A. Swernofsky
Reg. No. 33,040

The Swernofsky Law Group
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700